



---

# Anti- Methamphetamine Initiative Quarterly Report Summary

---

July–September 2008

Report Provided By:

Pima Prevention Partnership

for

Governor Brewer's Office for Children, Youth and Families  
Division for Substance Abuse Policy  
Released February 2009

---

# Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Summary .....	1
Coalition Activities.....	2
Data Collection .....	3
Strategic Plan .....	4
Environmental Strategies .....	5
Cultural Competency .....	5
Coalition Membership .....	6
Technical Assistance.....	6
Successes .....	6
Challenges .....	7
Recommendations.....	7

# Introduction

Governor Brewer's Office of Children, Youth, and Families (GOCYF) formed the Arizona Anti-Methamphetamine Initiative in January 2006 in response to a growing methamphetamine (meth) problem in the State of Arizona. Funding was awarded by the Parents Commission on Drug Education and Prevention to community coalitions statewide to combat the problem at the community level.

GOCYF worked with anti-methamphetamine coalitions to implement the *Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF)* model to guide their work. The *SPF* has five phases: Community Assessment, Community Mobilization/Capacity Building, Strategic Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation/Monitoring. Coalitions in the initiative implemented phases I and II from 2006-2008.

GOCYF began Phase III of the Arizona Anti-Methamphetamine Initiative in April 2008 by funding 15 coalition grantees who were tasked with accomplishing the following benchmarks:

- Show a reduction or prevention of methamphetamine use/abuse through data sources;
- Show an increase in awareness of the impact of methamphetamine on the community; and
- Show increases in community mobilization and coalition funding

In addition to contributing to professional and community knowledge, this benchmark data will be submitted to the Governor's Children's Cabinet as evidence for the Cabinet's strategic plan indicator: "Percentage of 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> graders who use methamphetamine" under its Goal #1: "Children and adolescents have access to affordable, high-quality physical and behavioral health care and can grow up in healthy environments."

Pima Prevention Partnership, under contract with GOCYF to evaluate the Arizona Anti-Methamphetamine Initiative, submits the following summary report of grantee activities and accomplishments during Phase III, Quarter Two (July-September 2008). Data for this report was culled from 14 quarterly reports submitted by the funded coalitions.

## Summary

This report is organized into nine sections with data garnered from the 14 submitted quarterly reports, followed by a Recommendations section submitted by Pima Prevention Partnership. The nine data sections are as follows: Coalition Activities; Data Collection; Strategic Plan; Environmental Strategies; Cultural Competency; Coalition Membership; Technical Assistance; Successes; and Challenges.

Data from the following coalitions (in alphabetical order) was received:

- *Alcohol and Methamphetamine Prevention and Education Coalition* serving La Paz County
- *Casa Grande Alliance* serving Pinal County
- *Citizens Against Substance Abuse* serving Coconino County
- *Cochise County Substance Abuse Coalition*
- *Gila County Meth Coalition*
- *Graham County Anti-Meth Alliance*
- *Greenlee County Meth Task Force*
- *Meth Free Alliance* serving Pima County
- *Metro Task Force* serving Santa Cruz County
- *Mohave County Tobacco Use Prevention Program*
- *Navajo County Coalition Against Drug Abuse*
- *Northeast Valley Coalition Against Methamphetamine* serving Maricopa County
- *Yavapai County Methamphetamine Advisory Task Force*
- *Yuma County Meth Nucleus Group*

Four themes emerged from these reports:

**All coalitions conducted activities to develop or maintain their coalition during the quarter.**

Coalitions reported partnering with additional local agencies/organizations and educating additional community members about meth use and abuse.

**All coalitions conducted activities to raise awareness of methamphetamine use or abuse problems during the quarter.**

Coalitions reported face-to-face outreach through education or health fairs, publishing newspaper advertisements articles, and submitting press releases to multiple media outlets. For example, one coalition reported training and certifying probation officers to identify and respond to meth use.

The majority of coalitions (67%) reported collecting data during the reporting period.

Data was collected from numerous sources, including: the 2008 Arizona Youth Survey; local law enforcement, including police and sheriff departments; the Arizona Department of Health Services, Division of Behavioral Services; and local surveys assessing the progress of prevention activities.

The majority of coalitions (86%) reported conducting activities supporting at least one environmental strategy during the quarter.

Examples of environmental strategies implemented by coalitions include: public education to change social norms about meth; community organizing and mobilizing to raise awareness about meth; and a social marketing campaign to increase awareness of the local impact of meth and promote recovery lifestyle.

Overall, funded coalitions maintained a high degree of fidelity to their Phase III, Quarter Two implementation plans.

## Coalition Activities

All coalitions were instructed to report the types of coalition development/maintenance activities they conducted during the quarter. Coalitions were also asked to report the number of participants that were engaged in each coalition development/maintenance activity. Activities during Phase III, Quarter Two included interactive forums and workshops on substance abuse issues, targeted information dissemination at public events, and mass information dissemination through print media outlets.

For example:

- Five (5) community forums and seven (7) substance abuse prevention workshops were held;
- 10,426 Arizona residents received information at education/health fairs;
- 79 newspaper ads/articles were submitted to print media outlets highlighting coalition efforts;

These activities led to coalition partnerships with 215 local agencies/organizations across the state.

The following table (Table 1: Coalition Activities) lists the number of coalitions that implemented each activity type and the total number of community members that were activity participants or recipients.

Table 1. Coalition Activities

Coalition Activities	Number of coalitions (N=14)	Number
Held a community forum or town hall	5	442 people
Attended training	5	6 members
Conducted training	7	13 trainings
Partnered with local agency or organization	11	215 organizations
Sent listserv messages	3	18 messages
Utilized websites	5	6 websites
Sent emails	4	560 emailed
Utilized TV	3	3654 spots*
Utilized radio	4	75 spots
Utilized newspaper ads/articles	9	79
Conducted PSAs	5	3719**
Conducted press releases	8	36
Participated in education fairs	10	7696 people
Participated in health fairs	6	220 people
Other activities	4	2510 people

\*3,642 TV ads were reported by one coalition

\*\*3,642 PSAs were reported by one coalition

In addition to the above listed activities, some coalitions reported conducting other coalition activities. For example, Gila County utilized county fairs and carnivals to host four family activities informing children and parents about the dangers of methamphetamine and substance abuse; Mohave County participated in the Andy Devine Parade to show coalition support and encouragement to those in recovery; Santa Cruz County placed a billboard in a high traffic area of the county to empower the community to say no to drugs and create awareness of the coalition; and Yavapai County held "Recovery Month" celebrations in partnership with the recovery community, where art displays allowed those in recovery to anonymously share their struggles.

# Data Collection

Phase III funded coalitions are obligated to demonstrate reductions in, and prevention of, methamphetamine use/abuse using one or more of the following data sources: the Arizona Youth Survey; county-specific epidemiology profiles; hospital discharge reports; emergency department visit reports; arrestee data; and crime reports.

During Phase III, Quarter Two, 67 percent (10) of coalitions reported collecting data. Details for specific activities are included in Table 2: Evaluation Activities, below.

Table 2. Evaluation Activities

Activity	Number of coalitions (N=14)	Percentage of coalitions (N=14)
Collected prevention data	8	57%
Collected treatment data	3	21%
Collected enforcement data	5	36%
Other data collected	4	29%
Contracted an evaluator	3	21%
Assessed community needs	3	21%
Used new data to modify or change goals and objectives	0	0%
Community-developed indicators	1	7%

## Prevention Data

Prevention data was collected by the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission in the 2008 Arizona Youth Survey (AYS). The 2008 AYS shows that methamphetamine use by youth in Arizona: 1) varies by geography; and 2) has decreased in all Arizona counties, in some instances by 50 percent or more. The percent of youth reporting past 30-day meth use varies from 0.3 percent to 1.8 percent. Overall, coalitions reported a reduction in past 30-day methamphetamine use by 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders. Highlights of the AYS County data reported by coalitions include:

*Methamphetamine use by 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> graders in the past 30 days:*

- Greenlee County reported a 3.9 percent decrease from 2006 to 2008; Decrease in percent of 10<sup>th</sup> graders from 6.3 percent in 2006 to 1.9% in 2008; **increase** 12<sup>th</sup> graders from 4.6 percent in 2006 to 16 percent in 2008.
- Navajo County reported an 80 percent decrease among 8<sup>th</sup> graders from 2.6 percent in 2006 to 0.5 percent in 2008; 68 percent decrease among 10<sup>th</sup> graders from 3.7 percent in 2006 to 1.2 percent in 2008; 68 percent decrease among 12<sup>th</sup> graders, from 2.5 percent in 2006 to 0.8 percent in 2008.

*Percent of 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup> graders using methamphetamine - lifetime:*

- Yuma County reported a decrease in 1.6 % of 8<sup>th</sup> graders from 3.3% in 2006 to 1.7% in 2008; Decrease of 3.4% of 10<sup>th</sup> graders from 6.1% in 2006 to 2.7% in 2008; Decrease of .90% of 12<sup>th</sup> graders from 6.6% in 2006 to 5.7% in 2008.

## Enforcement Data

Enforcement data was collected to reflect current trends in crime at the community level. All of the coalitions have membership that includes representation from law enforcement. Coalitions were asked to partner with law enforcement in their communities to report on current crime trends. Highlights of the enforcement data reported for Quarter 2 include:

- The Graham County Anti-Meth Coalition reported on arrestee data from the Safford Police Department showing a decrease in youth and adult arrests for Quarter two with zero youth arrests and five adult arrests.

## Data Collection

- Greenlee County reported a decrease in percentage of meth-related cases for residents in the County Jail. In 2006 the rate was 70% and by 2008 it had decreased to below 30%. From January 2007 to present, there were zero meth-positive drug tests for juvenile probationers. A reduction in the percentage of meth-related child dependency cases has also been reported, from 90% in mid-2005 to 20% in 2008.
- Navajo County reported a decrease in female drug-related arrests from 23 in August 2008 to 10 in September 2008.
- The Northeast Valley Coalition Against Methamphetamine used data from the City of Scottsdale Police Department showing a decrease of 191 methamphetamine specific drug cases for 2007-08. In 2006-07 599 cases were reported and in 2007-08 408 were reported.
- The Yuma County Meth Nucleus Group reported a decrease in the number of students that reported being arrested in Yuma County as follows: Decrease of .50 percent of 8<sup>th</sup> graders from 9.5 percent in 2006 to 9.0 percent in 2008; Decrease of 2.0 percent of 10<sup>th</sup> graders from 12.0 percent in 2006 to 10.0 percent in 2008; Increase in .80 percent of 12th graders from 12.0 percent in 2006 to 18.0 percent in 2008.

### Treatment Data

Treatment data was collected to reflect current trends in methamphetamine emergency room visits at the community level. Coalitions were provided with county hospital data from the GOCYF Division for Substance Abuse Policy. Highlights of the treatment data reported for Quarter Two include:

- The Yuma County Meth Nucleus Group reported on the number of drug related diagnoses in Yuma County, which showed drug related emergency department visits as lower in Yuma County than the state average. The Yuma County rate is .45 per 10,000 and the statewide rate is approximately 1.85 per 10,000.
- Greenlee County reported a decrease in the percentage of meth-related Ambulance calls. In 2006, approximately 25 percent of calls were meth-related compared to less than 10 percent in 2008.

## Strategic Plans

Coalitions were asked to report to the Governor's Office on a quarterly basis on the progress of their strategic plan goals and the activities and measurable outcomes associated with each goal.

Table 3. Status of Goals

Goal status	Number of goals N=36	Percentage of goals in status	Number of coalitions represented N=14
Completed	5	14%	3
In progress	22	61%	12
Have not started	6	17%	4
Not reported	3	8%	1

In total, 14 coalitions reported on 36 goals. Five goals were reported as "completed" by three coalitions and 22 goals were reported as "in progress" by 12 coalitions. Nine of 14 coalitions identified specific goals pertaining to the reduction of methamphetamine use or increased community/individual awareness regarding the dangers of drug use.

## Environmental Strategies

Coalitions were asked to report on environmental strategies that were implemented in Quarter Two and the activities and measurable outcomes for each strategy. In total, 30 strategies were identified by coalitions reporting this quarter. Of these strategies, slightly less than half (13) were true environmental strategies. Twelve out of 14 coalitions (86%) reported completing or progressing on at least one environmental strategy. While it was not a requirement for Anti-Meth coalitions to identify environmental strategies in their plans, eight reported conducting activities for at least one environmental strategy during Quarter Two.

Table 4. Environmental Strategies

Strategy status	Number of strategies N=30	Percentage of strategies in status	Number of coalitions represented N=14
Completed	8	27%	3
In progress	15	50%	9
Have not started	4	13%	3
Not reported	3	10%	2

## Cultural Competency

Coalitions were asked to report on any cultural competency activities that were conducted and/or attended. During Quarter Two, most of the coalitions did not conduct cultural competency activities. Coalitions that did conduct them focused efforts on youth-centered activities, including sponsoring or organizing youth-centered activities and attending tribal activities. The following activities were reported by coalitions.

Table 5. Cultural Competency Activities

Activity	Number of coalitions (N=14)	Percentage of coalitions (N=14)
Sponsored and/or organized youth-centered activities	3	21%
Attended youth-centered activities	7	50%
Sponsored and/or organized tribal activities	1	7%
Attended tribal activities	3	21%
Conducted cultural competency trainings	0	0%
Attended cultural competency trainings	2	14%
Conducted other activities as they relate to cultural competency	1	7%
Attended other activities as they relate to cultural competency	3	21%



## Coalition Membership

Coalitions were asked to report on membership changes that occurred during Quarter Two. Five of the 14 coalitions reported membership changes, four of the coalitions reported new membership and three of the coalitions reported losing a member. In total, nine individuals and one Chamber of Commerce group became new members of the coalitions. New members represented the following sectors:

- local government
- education
- business
- health care
- law enforcement
- military
- community organization
- the recovery community

## Technical Assistance

Coalitions were asked to report on technical assistance (TA) that was requested or received from PPP or other sources during Quarter Two. In total, four of the 14 coalitions reported that they had requested and/or received TA from PPP. Two additional coalitions reported receiving TA from other providers including Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America and Southeastern Arizona Behavioral Health Services New Turf. The following is a list of the types of TA requested and/or received.

### Technical Assistance Requested/Received from PPP

- Sustainability planning
- Community assessment training
- Strategic planning
- Organization training
- Educational materials for community activity
- Data management training

### Types of Technical Assistance Received from Other Providers

- Fundraising and sustainability planning
- Educational resources for health fairs and presentations
- Advocacy training
- Evaluation plan development
- Coalition assessment based on community change

## Successes

In addition to the information collected above, coalitions were given the opportunity to report on successes they have experienced. The following is a list of successes reported:

*Gila County* -A free “Methamphetamine Messenger” article appeared weekly in the Copper County News. The weekly article highlighted the Gila County Methamphetamine Coalition activities and information.

*Graham County* -The coalition was invited to partner with the DUI Task Force in presenting to the students at Eastern Arizona College.

*Greenlee County* -The most recent AYS data demonstrated that Greenlee County has relatively low rates of methamphetamine use, as indicated by past 30-day usage.

*La Paz (AMPEC)* -The La Paz Coalition established sub-coalitions in two outlying communities.

*Mohave County* -The success of MSTEPP’s “Celebrate Recovery” event at the Andy Devine Parade exceeded expectations in achieving awareness and community support for MSTEPP. Kingman’s “Walk Away From Drugs” was well attended and included honored guests from the state, including Attorney General Terry Goddard who spoke to a crowd of more than 2,000 people.

*Pima County* -Four neighborhood associations were engaged in strategic planning for a treatment needs assessment. A “Street Smarts” presentation was given at the Global Methamphetamine Summit in Prague, Czech Republic. Street Smarts presentations were adapted by the Pima County Attorney’s Office as “Safe by Design”, assisting neighbors with developing neighborhood watch and home protection tips.

*Pinal County* - James Walsh and Cindy Schaidler created a 20-minute video segment on methamphetamine and the coalition. The segment was produced by Pinal County and scheduled to air in October on public access cable channels throughout the county.

*Santa Cruz County* - Thirty-four adult and juvenile probation officers were trained to check probationers for possession of drugs. Eighteen Sheriff’s deputies, Nogales Police Department officers, and an evidence custodian were trained and certified in the proper testing techniques for cocaine and meth.



## Successes

*Yavapai County* -Yavapai County has seen a reduction in felony crime. This demonstrates to the community that positive results are happening through combined efforts to address substance abuse.

*Yuma County* -Yuma County experienced success related to collaboration with law enforcement agencies and maintaining a diverse group. The coalition reported its first representative from the gay/lesbian/ transgender community in Yuma.

## Challenges

Coalitions were also asked to report on any challenges they may have faced during the reporting period. The following challenges were reported by coalitions for Quarter Two:

*Graham County*: Coalition members hold positions with other agencies and it is often a challenge for them to participate in Coalition-sponsored events due to their schedules.

*Greenlee County*: Duplication of services is an issue as schools are markedly less generous with classroom time for substance abuse prevention presentations.

*La Paz County*: Coalition activities are met with the challenges of over stretched volunteers and distance between communities.

*Maricopa County*: The coalition is seeking contacts at local hospitals to obtain epidemiology data.

*Mohave County*: The unexpected passing of a board member caused challenges on numerous fronts. The resistance of the Lake Havasu CLEAN coalition towards MSTEPP and maintaining the participation of the tribes is proving difficult. MSTEPP recognized the need to fill its Board of Directors in accordance with its bylaws.

*Pima County*: The time required of volunteers to train the speaker's bureau and to collect data for quarterly reports created time constraints for task force members.

*Pinal County*: Pinal County reported inconsistency in its efforts to collect data.

*Yavapai County*: Funding cuts will impact fundraising and sustainability for the coalition; helping coalition members to understand the importance of addressing these issues has been a challenge.

*Yuma County*: A new computer system has made it difficult to gather county data.

## Recommendations

Two areas requiring additional support were identified in Quarter Two. Recommendations for addressing coalition needs regarding quarterly reporting and environmental strategies are listed below.

### ***Quarterly reporting***

#### Revise Goals and Objectives

Provide technical assistance to coalitions with the revision of their strategic plans goals and objectives to reflect the change(s) they wish to achieve in their communities.

#### Enhance Measurable Outcomes

Develop coalitions' capacity to identify and report measurable outcomes which accurately reflect the impact of their activities in the community.

#### Increase Data Collection Capacity

Develop coalitions' capacity for collecting data on the benchmarks that are to be reported on quarterly.

### ***Environmental strategies***

#### Improve Understanding of Environmental Strategies

Further develop coalitions' understanding of what constitute true environmental strategies via training or technical assistance.

Pima Prevention Partnership is currently conducting evaluation and technical assistance through one-on-one site visits with Anti-Methamphetamine coalitions. Topics that are being addressed during these site visits include quarterly reporting requirements as well as coalition strategic plans and environmental strategies.